

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

PARKERSBURG DIVISION

RONNIE MITCHELL HUNT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:12-cv-01154

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Ronnie Mitchell Hunt's Complaint seeking review of the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security¹ ("Commissioner") [ECF 2]. By Standing Order entered September 2, 2010, and filed in this case on April 19, 2012, this action was referred to former United States Magistrate Judge Mary E. Stanley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). On April 8, 2013, this action, following Magistrate Judge Stanley's retirement, was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley. (ECF 12.) On August 12, 2013 Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R [ECF 13] recommending that this Court reverse the final decision of the Commissioner, remand this case for further proceedings affirm the final decision of the Commissioner, dismiss this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to

¹ Carolyn W. Colvin became the Acting Commissioner of Social Security on February 14, 2013, replacing the former Social Security Commissioner, Michael J. Astrue, the original Defendant in this case. Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Ms. Colvin is automatically substituted as the Defendant.


which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections to the PF&R were due on August 29, 2013. To date, no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [ECF 13], **REVERSES** the final decision of the Commissioner, **REMANDS** this case to the Commissioner, **DISMISSES** the Complaint [ECF 2], and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this case from the Court's docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: August 30, 2013



THOMAS E. JOHNSTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE